

**REMARKS**

**Summary of the Office Action**

Claims 1-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by *Kawada* (USP No. 6,640,002).

Claim 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Kawada*.

Claims 9-14 are objected to as being in improper form (multiple dependent claims cannot depend from any other multiple dependent claims). The Examiner did not examine those claims due to the objection.

The claims, title, and abstract are objected to for certain informalities.

**Summary of the Response to the Office Action**

Applicants amend claims 1, 6, 7, 12-14 and cancel claims 2-5 and 9-11, without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicants amend the Abstract and Title of the specification. Accordingly, claims 1, 6-8, and 12-14 are presently pending.

**The Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)**

Claims 1-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by *Kawada*. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection for at least the following reasons.

Applicants respectfully submit that the Office Action has not established that *Kawada* anticipates each and every feature of Applicants' claimed invention and that all rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) should be withdrawn. Newly amended independent claim 1 recites, in part, "each of the plurality of the metallic materials includes a circular column portion, and the

connected work member is formed by arranging and connecting the plurality of metallic materials coaxially.” Newly amended independent claim 1 also recites, in part, “wherein the photographing process rotates the connected work member per each of fixed angles around the rotation axial line of the central axial line, creates the photographic image of the connected work members in the respective angles, and performs the confirmation process in the respectively created photographic images.” *Kawada* fails to teach or suggest at least these features of claim 1. Thus, the rejection of newly amended claim 1 should be withdrawn.

As pointed out in M.P.E.P § 2131, a claim is anticipated by a prior art reference only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 2 USPQ2d 1051 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) should be withdrawn because *Kawada* does not teach or suggest each feature of newly amended independent claim 1.

Additionally, Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 6-8 and 12-14 are also allowable insofar as they recite the patentable combinations of features recited in claim 1, as well as reciting additional features that further distinguish over the applied prior art.

#### **The Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claim 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kawada*. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection for at least the following reasons.

The Office Action has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness at least because *Kawada*, whether alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all the recited features of independent claim 1. Newly amended independent claim 1 recites, in part, “each of the plurality

of the metallic materials includes a circular column portion, and the connected work member is formed by arranging and connecting the plurality of metallic materials coaxially,” as amended.

*Kawada*, whether taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest at least these features of claim 1.

As previously demonstrated, *Kawada* fails to teach or suggest each and every feature of newly amended claim 1. Thus, the rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn.

As pointed out in M.P.E.P. § 2143.03, all the claimed limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art to establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention. Because *Kawada* or *Haramiishi*, whether taken alone or in combination, fails to teach or suggest each feature of newly amended independent claim 1, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn. Furthermore, claim 8 depends from independent claim 1. Accordingly, claim 8 is also allowable because of the additional features it recites and the reasons stated above.

**Conclusion**


In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and the timely allowance of all pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**

By:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
David E. Connor  
Reg. No. 59,868

Dated: June 12, 2008

**CUSTOMER NO. 009629**  
**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**  
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
Tel: 202-739-3000  
Fax: 202-739-3001